

V.

The plaintiff was a part of the Talent2 group of companies and functioned as a recruiting company whereby its principal business was the provision of outsourcing services for functions such as payroll, executive search and recruitment. The first defendant ('defendant') commenced employment with the plaintiff on 7 January 2008. Among the terms and conditions of his employment were: (i) not to disclose or make use of the plaintiff's confidential information; and (ii) not to induce or attempt to induce the plaintiff's employee to terminate his or her employment with Talent2 upon cessation of the defendant's employment with the plaintiff. However, on 17 January 2011, the defendant tendered his resignation with the plaintiff and in February 2011, he joined Kelly Services (Malaysia) Sdn Bhd, which was the plaintiff's competitor. It was the plaintiff's averment that the defendant had unlawfully interfered with the plaintiff's trade and business and had caused the plaintiff to suffer loss and damage. The plaintiff thus filed an application for injunctive relief restraining the defendant from doing, *inter alia*, the following, *ie*, (i) to solicit, entice or attempt to solicit or entice, either directly or indirectly, any present or former employee, consultant or agent of the plaintiff to cease acting as an employee, consultant or agent of the plaintiff for a period of six months from the date of his termination; and (ii) disclosing the plaintiff's confidential information to others or otherwise exploiting the said confidential information without the plaintiff's consent. The issues that arose for consideration herein were: (i) whether there were serious issues to be tried; (ii) whether the balance of convenience lies in favour of the plaintiff; and (iii) whether damages was an adequate remedy.

Held (allowing plaintiff's application):

A

- (1) There are serious issues to be tried in this case. Apart from the issue as regards to breach of the non-solicitation provision, there was the issue as to whether the defendant's actions would be contrary to other terms of his contract of employment. Further, the defendant had not only handed over his own letter of resignation but had also handed over some of the other staff's resignation letters. The events, among others, signified a serious issue to be determined during the hearing and would also require a careful perusal of the various incidences of alleged breaches (*Keet Gerald Francis Noel John v. Mohd Noor & Ors*; foll). (paras 21, 22 & 23)

B

C

- (2) The court had carefully weighed the harm that the grant of an injunction would cause as against the harm that would result if it were not granted. In the final analysis, what the plaintiff was seeking to do was to enforce what the defendant had contractually agreed to do. This factor and the fact that the plaintiff would be financially capable of meeting its financial obligations as to damages showed that the balance of convenience lies in the plaintiff's favour. Further, in the event the defendant is successful, the quantum of damages would be an adequate remedy. (paras 30 & 34)

D

E

Case(s) referred to:

Associated Tractors Sdn Bhd v. Chan Boon Heng & Anor [1990] 2 CLJ 157; [1990] 1 CLJ (Rep) 30 SC (**refd**)

Hampstead & Suburban Properties Ltd v. Diomedous [1969] 1 Ch 248 (**refd**)

Keet Gerald Francis Noel John v. Mohd Noor @ Harun Abdullah & 2 Ors [1995] 1 CLJ 293 CA (**foll**)

F

Rajaram v. Ganesh t/a Golden Harvest Trading Corp & Ors [1995] 1 SLR 159 (**refd**)

Svenson Hair Centre Sdn Bhd v. Irene Chin Zee Ling [2008] 8 CLJ 386 HC (**refd**)

Tien Ik & Sdn Bhd & Ors v. Peter Kuok Khoon Kwong [1993] 1 CLJ 9 SC (**refd**)

G

Legislation referred to:

Contracts Act 1950, s. 28

For the plaintiff - Elaine Yap (Azmimi Pharmacy with her); M/s Wong & Partners
For the defendant - R Ravindra Kumar (Deepak Mahadevan with him); M/s Raja,
Darryl & Loh

H

Reported by Kumitha Abd Majid

I

A

JUDGMENT

Amelia Tee Abdullah JC:

B [1] The plaintiff, Agensi Pekerjaan Talent2 International Sdn Bhd, had filed a summons in chambers seeking, *inter alia*, the following injunctive relief against the defendant, Kenneth Yong Fu Loong:

- (i) An injunction until trial or further order that the defendant be restrained, whether by himself or his agent or otherwise, from doing or attempting to do the following:
- C (a) soliciting, enticing, or attempting to solicit or entice, either directly or indirectly, any present or former employee, consultant or agent of the plaintiff to cease acting as an employee, consultant or agent of the plaintiff for a period of six months from the date of his termination;
- D (b) Disclosing to others or using for the defendant's benefit or the benefit of others, all or any or more categories of the plaintiff's confidential information as listed in schedule A such as information concerning the plaintiff's clients, candidates or business associates or otherwise exploiting the said confidential information without the plaintiff's consent;
- E (c) Disclosing to others or making use of confidential information of the plaintiff's clients, candidates or business associates or other confidential information as listed in schedule A to directly or indirectly approach, induce, solicit or persuade or attempt to approach, induce, solicit or persuade any person or entity who or which was or is a client of the plaintiff to undertake or perform work to undertake or perform work or services for that person or entity to cease doing business with the plaintiff or
- F reduce the amount or business which the person or entity would normally do with the plaintiff;
- G (ii) An order that the defendant, whether by himself or his agent or otherwise howsoever, deliver up all of the plaintiff's confidential information as listed in schedule A, in any form whatsoever in the possession, power, custody or control of the defendant within 14 days of the service of the order of the court on the defendant or his solicitors, to the plaintiff or its authorised representative or agents.

I

[2] At the material time when the injunctive relief was applied for, the defendant, Kenneth Yong Fu Loong was the sole defendant and Kok Pik Yin was joined as a defendant only at a later stage. As such, this application is in relation to the first defendant, Kenneth Yong Fu Loong only. A

Background B

[3] The plaintiff is part of the Talent2 group of companies, a multinational business group with its headquarters in Sydney, Australia. The plaintiff is a recruiting company and its principal business is the provision of outsourcing services for functions such as payroll, executive search and recruitment. C

[4] The defendant commenced employment with the plaintiff on 7 January 2008. The terms and conditions of his employment are as set out in the letter of offer of employment dated 17 December 2007. The provisions relevant to this case are reproduced below for easy reference. D

Clause 18 - Confidential Information

You agree to keep confidential at all times and not to disclose or make use of, except for the benefit of Talent2, at any time either during or subsequent to your employment any confidential information. "Confidential Information" is further defined below. E

You also agree not to deliver, reproduce, or in any way allow the confidential information or any document relating to the confidential information to be given to or used by any third parties without the specific direction or consent of a duly authorized representative of Talent2. F

Your obligation to maintain the confidential information in confidence will only be relieved if you have the written consent of a duly authorized representative of Talent2 or if such disclosure is required by law. G

If you are no longer employed by Talent2 (for whatever reason), you agree to promptly surrender and deliver to Talent2 all records, materials, equipment, drawings, documents and data of any nature pertaining to the confidential information. H

Clause 20 - Post-Employment Restrictive Covenants

You acknowledge that: I

(a) ...

(b) ...

(c) ...

- A** You agree that upon the cessation of your employment for any reason, you must not for the specified period after the cessation of your employment, within any area that Talent2 operates its businesses, without the prior written consent of Talent2, directly or indirectly do any of the following:
- B** (a) Induce or attempt to induce any director, manager or employee of Talent2 to terminate his or her employment or engagement with Talent2, whether or not that person would act in breach of that person's contract with Talent2;
- C** (b) Directly or indirectly approach, induce, solicit or persuade or attempt to approach, induce, solicit or persuade any person or entity who or which was or is a client of Talent2 within the last 12 months of your employment with Talent2 to undertake or perform work or services for that person or entity or to cease doing business with Talent2 or reduce the amount of business which the person or
- D** entity would normally do with Talent2; or
- (c) Directly or indirectly assist, approach, induce, solicit or persuade or attempt to assist, approach, induce, solicit or persuade any person or entity to undertake any of the activities restricted in the above
- E** sub clauses.

The Specified Period for the restrictive covenant is:

- (a) During the period of six months following cessation of employment or otherwise determined by Talent2 or a court;
- F** (b) During the period of three months following the cessation of employment.

G [5] On 17 January 2011, the defendant tendered his resignation with the plaintiff. He joined Kelly Services (Malaysia) Sdn Bhd ("Kelly Services"), a competitor of the plaintiff in February 2011.

The Plaintiff's Averments

H [6] In his affidavit in support of the application for injunctive relief, Leigh Howard, the Director, South East Asia of the plaintiff avers that:

- (i) On 17 January 2001, the defendant had handed over his letter of resignation together with the resignation letters of Kok Pik Yin, Wong Siew Kuen, Teo Kok Nian and Thirumagal Devaraj to Leigh Howard and had orally informed that he was taking his entire team with him;
- I** (ii) The defendant and his entire team are now employed with Kelly Services;

- (iii) He was informed by Linda Fraulein an office manager and Kalwinder Kaur a managing consultant of the plaintiff that the defendant together with Wong Siew Kuen, Teo Kok Nian and Kok Pin Yin had approached them on 10 February 2011 during lunch at Menara Weld and had invited or suggested that Kalwinder Kaur cease her employment with the plaintiff and join Kelly Services; A
B
- (iv) On or around 17 February 2011, the defendant whether by himself or through one Thirumagal Devaraj had made use of confidential information to directly or indirectly approach, induce or solicit Malaysia Marine and Heavy Engineering Sdn Bhd (“Malaysia Marine”), an existing client of the plaintiff since 14 October 2010, to undertake or perform recruitment services from them. This was discovered through an e-mail dated 18 February 2011 to the plaintiff for the attention of Thirumagal Devaraj which e-mail contained the signed terms of business between Kelly Engineering and Malaysia Marine which was prepared by the defendant in his capacity as Consulting Director of Kelly Engineering; C
D
- (v) Sometime in or around February 2011, the defendant made use of confidential information to contact Cameron (M) Sdn Bhd (“Cameron”) for business. Cameron was a client of the plaintiff since 28 September 2010. This was discovered when Leigh Howard met Nicole Lee, the Human Resource Manager of Cameron and was informed that the defendant had contacted her between 1 February 2011 and 17 February 2011 for business; E
- (vi) On or around 4 November 2010, the plaintiff had presented the profile and arranged for an interview for its candidate named Mohd Azli bin Surip (“the candidate”) for the position of Quality Manager but was unsuccessful. The assignment was handled by Leong Yee Leng and Kok Pik Yin. On or around February 2011, the defendant had, either through himself or through his agent, Kok Pik Yin, made use of confidential information concerning the candidate by attempting to resubmit the candidate’s resume to Air Products Malaysia Sdn Bhd (“Air Products”) through Kelly Services. F
G
- On 24 February 2011, the plaintiff received an e-mail from Air Products enquiring if the candidate would be interested in the position of Quality Engineer. However, when contacted, the candidate informed that Kok Pik Yin had called him two weeks earlier for the same position and forwarded his resume to Air Products. H
- [7] The plaintiff avers that the actions of the defendant amounted to unlawful interference with the plaintiff’s trade and business and had caused the plaintiff to suffer loss and damage. I

- A **[8]** In his affidavit in reply (encl. 6), the defendant Kenneth Yong Fu Loong denied all the plaintiff's allegations. He states that he had been advised by his solicitors that some of the terms and conditions of employment were prohibited under local laws and therefore unreasonable and unconscionable. In claiming that he had never been in breach of his contractual duties to the plaintiff, the defendant further states that:
- B
- (i) Kok Pik Yin, Wong Siew Kuen, Teo Kuok Nian and Thirumagal Devaraj had decided on their own accord to terminate their employment with the plaintiff and to join a competitor without any inducement or encouragement on his part. The said employees were headhunted independently by Glenn Thomas Davies, the General Manager of Professional and Technical, who had confirmed an affidavit to that effect;
- C
- (ii) The said employees had tendered their resignation letters to the defendant as their immediate superior in the plaintiff. He claimed to have an obligation to inform his superior Leigh Howard about their resignations and to hand over the resignation letters to him;
- D
- (iii) Although he was at Menara Weld on 10 February 2011 for lunch with Wong Siew Kuen, Teo Kuok Nian and Kok Pik Yin and had met and exchanged pleasantries with Linda Fraulein and Kalwinder Kaur, he denied any attempt to induce either Linda Fraulein or Kalwinder Kaur to cease their employment with the plaintiff and to join Kelly Services;
- E
- (iv) The defendant denied relying on or using confidential information after the cessation of his employment with the plaintiff and avers that the plaintiff's clients and candidate information was created by various search methodologies compiled, obtained and extracted from information and sources available in the public domain;
- F
- (v) He denied ever being in breach of his contractual obligations to the plaintiff or ever inducing, soliciting or persuading any person to cease doing business with the plaintiff or to reduce doing business with the plaintiff;
- G
- (vi) Malaysia Marine was a long standing client of Kelly Services even before he joined Kelly Services. A contract between Kelly Services with Malaysia Marine signed on 13 August 2010 was tendered as proof. He claimed that the e-mail sent to Thirumagal Devaraj was wrongly sent and that the terms and conditions of the contract signed between Kelly Services and Malaysia Marine dated 17 February 2011 were already agreed before he joined Kelly Services;
- H
- I

- (vii) The defendant avers that Cameron was also a long standing client of Kelly Services. A contract signed between Cameron and Kelly Services signed on 26 January 2010 was tendered as proof. He denied meeting or contacting Nicole Lee for business as alleged by Leigh Howard but claimed that after his departure from the plaintiff, all his dealings with Cameron had been with a Ms Florence Tan, the Senior Manager, Human Resource Asia Pacific & Middle East;
- (viii) According to the defendant, Air Products too was a long standing client of Kelly Services. He denied using information derived from his employment with the plaintiff. He claimed that the candidate's name was obtained by Kok Pik Yin through an "Executive Search". The candidate was then contacted and he e-mailed his resume to Kok Pik Yin after the defendant had left the plaintiff;
- (ix) Kelly Services had been operating in the Malaysian recruitment market since 1984 whilst the plaintiff had only been operating since 2007. As such, Kelly Services would have a bigger share of the recruitment market in the country.
- [9]** Thirumagal a/p Devaraj, Teo Kuok Nian, Liyana Michelle Wong Siew Kuen and Kok Pik Yin had all affirmed affidavits denying that they were induced by the defendant to leave the plaintiff to join Kelly Services but that they had all tendered their resignations on their own volition. In addition:
- (i) Thirumagal a/p Devaraj averred in her affidavit (encl. 7) that the contract between Malaysia Marine and Kelly Services dated 17 February 2011 contained a revision of the terms and conditions previously agreed between the parties on 13 August 2010;
- (ii) Teo Kuok Nian and Liyana Michelle Wong Siew Kuen stated in their affidavits (encls. 8 & 9) that when they met Linda Fraulein and Kalwinder Kaur on 10 February 2011, they had only exchanged pleasantries. They both denied that that the defendant or any of his other colleagues had invited or suggested that Linda Fraulein or Kalwinder Kaur cease their employment with the plaintiff to join Kelly Services;
- (iii) Kok Pik Yin averred that in February 2011, he was requested by Kelly Services to headhunt for candidates for the position of Quality Engineer. She then carried out an "Executive Search" where many candidates were identified, including Mohd Azli bin Surip.

- A [10] Linda Fraulein a/p Stanley Christie Lawrence had affirmed an affidavit (encl. 16) stating *inter alia* that on 10 February 2011 at Menara Weld, the defendant had commented or suggested to Kalwinder Kaur that she should end her employment with the plaintiff and join Kelly Services.
- B [11] Both parties have cited the case of *Keet Gerald Francis Noel John v. Mohd Noor @ Harun Abdullah & 2 Ors* [1995] 1 CLJ 293 as a leading authority in relation to the grant of interlocutory and interim injunctions. In that case His Lordship Gopal Sri Ram JCA held as follows:
- C ... the correct approach to be adopted and the stages of reasoning involved in the process of arriving at the conclusion as to whether interlocutory injunctive relief should be granted or withheld are those that have been neatly summarised by Hashim Yeop Sani J., (as he was then) (in *Mohamed Zainuddin v. Yap Chee Seng* [1978] 1 MLJ 40. This is what that very eminent Judge said in that case (at page 42):
- D Firstly to discover whether the plaintiff's case is frivolous or vexatious. If it is not, then to decide in whose favour the balance of convenience lies. If these factors are evenly balanced it may not be improper for the Court to take into account any tipping in the balance as revealed by affidavits ... Secondly if the plaintiffs were to succeed at the trial,
- E whether they would be adequately compensated for the interim restriction on their activities which the grant of an interlocutory injunction would have imposed. The Judge then considers the balance of convenience, and if the relevant factors were evenly balanced the Court should grant an interlocutory injunction which would maintain the *status quo*. It is said that at that stage the Court is not justified in
- F embarking upon anything resembling a trial of the action upon conflicting affidavits. (emphasis added).
- G [12] And in the Supreme Court case of *Tien Ik Sdn Bhd & 4 Ors v. Peter Kuok Khoon Kwong* [1993] 1 CLJ 9, Jemuri Serjan CJ (Borneo) observed that a judge hearing an application for an interim injunction should not, in his judgment, give the impression that he had in fact disposed of the main action on its merits.
- H [13] It is also relevant to note that what Gopal Sri Ram JCA said in the case of *Keet Gerald Francis (supra)*:
- I To summarise, a Judge hearing an application for interlocutory injunction should undertake an inquiry along the following lines:
- First, he must ask himself whether the totality of the facts presented before him discloses a *bona fide* serious issue to be tried. He must, when considering this question, bear in mind that the pleadings and evidence are incomplete at that stage. Above all, he must refrain from making any determination on the merits of the claim or any defence to it. It is sufficient if he identifies with precision the issues raised on the joinder and decide whether these are serious enough to merit a

trial. If he finds, upon a consideration of all the relevant material before him, including submissions of Counsel, that no serious question is disclosed, that is an end of the matter and the relief is refused. On the other hand if he does find that there are serious questions to be tried, he should move on to the next step of the inquiry;

A

Second, having found that an issue has been disclosed that requires further investigation, he must consider where the justice of the case lies. In making his assessment, he must take into account all relevant matters, including the practical realities of the case before him. He must weigh the harm that the injunction would provide by its grant against the harm that would result from its refusal. He is entitled to take into account, *inter alia*, the relative financial standing of the litigants before him. If after weighing all matters, he comes to the conclusion that the plaintiff would suffer greater injustice if relief is withheld, then he would be entitled to grant the injunction especially if he is satisfied that the plaintiff is in a financial position to meet his undertaking in damages. Similarly, if he concludes that the defendant would suffer the greater injustice by the grant of an injunction, he would be entitled to refuse relief.

B

C

D

Thirdly, the Judge must have in the forefront of his mind that the remedy that he is asked to administer is discretionary, intended to produce a just result for the period between the date of the application and the trial proper and intended to maintain the *status quo* ... Accordingly, the Judge would be entitled to take into account all discretionary considerations, such as delay in the making of the application or any adequate alternative remedy that would satisfy the plaintiff's equity, such as an award of monetary compensation in the event that he succeeds in establishing his claim at the trial.

E

F

[14] The court also notes that in the case of *Associated Tractors Sdn Bhd v. Chan Boon Heng & Anor* [1990] 2 CLJ 157; [1990] 1 CLJ (Rep) 30 the Supreme Court had held that "the most important factor to consider as a matter of principle is the question of whether *in lieu* of the injunction damages would be an adequate and proper remedy because in the matter of injunctions and exercising its jurisdiction the court acts upon the principle of preventing irreparable damage".

G

The Decision

[15] In coming to a decision in this case, the court has adopted the approach so meticulously set out in the case of *Keet Gerald Francis (supra)*. Firstly, the court has carefully considered whether the totality of the facts presented discloses a *bona fide* serious issue to be tried. In this regard, the court has considered all relevant materials including the submissions of both parties. In coming to a decision, the court is mindful of the exhortations of the Court of Appeal that it must refrain from making any determination on the merits of the claim or any defence.

H

I

A Whether There Are Serious Issues To Be Tried

[16] The defendant submits that there is no serious question to be tried. The basis of this argument is that the plaintiff's claim is premised on two main grounds namely the alleged breach of the non-solicitation and duty of confidence clauses in the contract between the parties.

B

[17] On the breach of the non-solicitation clause, the defendant's argument is that the plaintiff's allegations on this score relates to matters arising before the cessation of the defendant's employment "and is thereby irrelevant". Further the employees alleged to have been enticed had filed affidavits confirming that they were not enticed or induced to leave the plaintiff's employment. There was also a letter from a Mr Glenn Thomas Davies from Kelly Services confirming that he had headhunted the defendant's colleagues independently.

C

D

[18] As regards the incident at Menara Weld, it is submitted that apart from the defendant denying the allegation, the three others who were together with the defendant at the time had affirmed affidavits stating that at no time did the defendant invite or suggest to either Linda Fraulein or Kalwinder Kaur that they cease their employment with the plaintiff and join Kelly Services. It was also pointed out that Kalwinder herself had not affirmed any affidavit in respect of the incident.

E

[19] On the breach of duty of confidence issue, the defendant had denied the allegations contending instead that the three clients specifically mentioned had all been clients of Kelly Services before the defendant's employment. Documents have been exhibited to show the existence of the prior contracts as well as an e-mail correspondence from a Florence Tan from Cameron to confirm that it was she who had approached the defendant at Kelly Services in February 2011. On this score, it is submitted that there is no proof that the defendant himself had taken from or disclosed any evidence of the plaintiff.

F

G

[20] The defendant has also advanced an argument that that the relief sought by the plaintiff amounts to a restraint in trade which is caught by s. 28 of the Contracts Act 1950 as the plaintiff is seeking an injunction to prevent the defendant from contacting or dealing with the plaintiff's clients. The defendant submits that due to the similar nature of business of the plaintiff and Kelly Services, there is bound to be some overlaps in the clients of both and if he is prevented from dealing with the mutual clients of both the defendant and Kelly Services, he will be unable to fulfil his contractual obligations and may well be terminated by Kelly Services.

H

I

[21] The court has considered these arguments and finds that there are serious issues to be tried in this case. The court finds that quite apart from the issue as regards a breach of the non-solicitation provision, there

is the issue as to whether the defendant's actions would be contrary to other terms of his contract of employment. As this court has already stated at the time of dismissal of the defendant's striking out application, these issues would include:

whether it would be contrary to some other terms of his letter of employment such as the requirement to be honest and to act in good faith (clause 12(a)), to maintain appropriate ethical standards (clause 12(b)), and to use his best endeavors to protect and promote Talent2's business (clause 12(e)).

[22] The affidavits affirmed on behalf of the plaintiff would reveal that on 7 January 2001, the defendant had not only handed over his own letter of resignation but he had handed over the resignation letters of Kok Pik Yin, Wong Siew Kuen, Teo Kok Nian and Thirumagal Devaraj to Leigh Howard. There is also the averment that he had at that point in time orally informed Leigh Howard that he was taking his entire team with him. It is not disputed that the defendant and all four persons aforementioned are currently with Kelly Services. The events of 17 January 2001 and its significance is a serious issue to be determined during the hearing.

[23] Whilst the above episode may not strictly fall within the non-solicitation provision in cl. 20, however it would nevertheless be a serious issue to be tried as to whether it would tantamount to a breach of a duty of fidelity obligation. This issue would require a careful perusal and consideration of the various incidences of alleged breaches.

[24] The court is satisfied that in this case there are serious questions of law and fact in dispute between the parties. That being so, the next step is to consider where the balance of convenience lies.

Where Does The Balance Of Convenience Lie?

[25] It is the defendant's contention that the balance of convenience lies in its favour as the plaintiff had not established that it would suffer serious injustice apart from stating that the defendant will cause serious, incalculable loss in terms of misuse and potential disclosure of confidential information, loss of market share and erosion of the reasonable expectation of the plaintiff in the fidelity of its employees and that such loss cannot be quantified in money terms. The defendant contends that the plaintiff's reasons are baseless when viewed against the injustice that he may suffer if he is prevented from contacting or dealing with mutual clients of the plaintiff and Kelly Services. If he is prevented from carrying out his contractual obligations to Kelly Services, it may render his position as Consulting Director redundant. Further, he will suffer loss of reputation as he may be perceived as a person without integrity and untrustworthy.

A [26] The defendant claims that the balance of convenience lies in his favour as he will suffer irreparable harm, damage and losses which cannot be financially compensated.

B [27] The plaintiff, on the other hand, contends that the balance of convenience, if it applies at all, lies in its favour. In the first place, it is the plaintiff's submission that the balance of convenience test is not intended to apply in every case. He cites the Singapore case of *Rajaram v. Ganesh t/a Golden Harvest Trading Corp & Ors* [1995] 1 SLR 159 where Kan Ting Chiu J quoted Lord Diplock as saying that "Where there is a clear breach the question of balance of convenience does not arise". (*Hampstead & Suburban Properties Ltd v. Diomedous* [1969] 1 Ch 248).

D [28] And even if the court is minded to apply the balance of convenience test, the plaintiff submits that the balance of convenience clearly favours the granting of an injunction against the defendant. If the injunction is granted and the defendant subsequently succeeds in his defence, he will not have suffered any loss as the injunction only seeks to restrain him from doing what he has covenanted not to do. On the other hand if the injunction is not granted and the solicitation of key personnel and further disclosure or use of confidential information is allowed to continue, the loss to the plaintiff will not be compensable.

F [29] Further, it was been submitted that the essence of the plaintiff's action is to restrain disclosure. And once confidential information has been disclosed, no amount of damages can make it secret or confidential again.

G [30] After carefully considering the submissions of both parties on this issue, the court finds that the balance of convenience would tilt in favour of the plaintiff. The court has carefully weighed the harm that the grant of an injunction would cause as against the harm that would result if it were not granted. The court agrees that in the final analysis what the plaintiff is seeking to do is to enforce what the defendant had contractually agreed to do. This factor and the fact that the plaintiff would be financially capable of meeting its financial obligations as to damages leads the court to make a finding that the balance of convenience lies in the plaintiff's favour.

Whether Damages Is An Adequate Remedy?

I [31] Lastly, the court has considered whether damages would be an adequate remedy in this case. The plaintiff contends that damages would not be an adequate remedy. If an injunction is not granted, the loss suffered by the plaintiff would be irreparable and incalculable in terms of losing its market share for which it had expended significant time and

money to develop its customer and candidate lists as well the erosion of the reasonable expectation of the plaintiff in the fidelity of its employees. A

[32] The defendant, on the other hand, argues that any loss suffered by the plaintiff, if any, can be compensated in monetary terms if the injunction is disallowed and the plaintiff succeeds in proving actual loss or damage from the defendant's alleged breach. B

[33] On this issue, the court can do no better than to refer to the case of *Svenson Hair Centre Sdn Bhd v. Irene Chin Zee Ling* [2008] 8 CLJ 386 where Vincent Ng J held as follows: C

I hold that **damages will not be an adequate compensation for the plaintiff in view of the very nature of the breach of contractual prohibition and confidence**, which make it difficult for the plaintiff to quantify monetarily its loss of patronage of customers and/or the long term loss and damage to the Bella Beauty Business business, strategies and competitiveness. *On the contrary, any damage occasioned to the defendant as a result of the grant of the injunction can be quantified as she is only an employee of the competing business for which she draws a salary and a commission on sales.* I find that the balance of convenience clearly lies in favour of the injunction being granted, and that the defendant would certainly be able to recover any damages (if and when awarded) from the plaintiff, a well established business entity, whereas even if damages were to be a sufficient remedy for the plaintiff the converse is doubtful. (emphasis added) D E

Conclusion F

[34] In conclusion, the court finds that the questions posed in *Keet Gerald Francis (supra)* have all been asked and answered. The court finds that there are serious questions of law and facts to be determined at the trial. The court further finds that the balance of convenience leans in favour of the plaintiff for the issue of an interim injunction against the defendant. And lastly, the court is satisfied that in the event that the defendant is successful, the quantum of damages would be an adequate remedy. G

[35] Accordingly, the court hereby allows the plaintiff's application in prayers (1)(a), (b) and (c), (2), (4) and costs to be taxed, if not otherwise agreed. H

I